



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,260	08/20/2003	John Patrick Romeo	1033-SS00413	7476
34456	7590	02/10/2006	EXAMINER	
TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P. 5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265 AUSTIN, TX 78746			PATEL, HEMANT SHANTILAL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/644,260	ROMEO, JOHN PATRICK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hemant Patel	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The applicant response dated December 9, 2005 in response to Office action dated September 7, 2005 has been recorded.

The revised drawing for Fig. 1 is accepted.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on December 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 20, the Applicant argues, "Saleh does not disclose receiving response from a software agent associated with a network device". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Saleh discloses that the supervisory interface application 40 may reside on one of the supervisor's terminal and remotely access ACD control applications 42, 44 (device agents) (col. 4, ll. 5-12). The application 40 functions to access the related application 42, 44 and make the requested changes (col. 5, ll. 32-34). The proper applications convert the command into format, which the CPU 28 can execute. The command is sent to the CPU 28 (by the control application) and the CPU confirms execution of the change (results to requesting application, in this case control application) (col. 6, ll. 37-42). It is known in the art that CPU is merely a hardware that executes one instruction at a time given to it by software application, in this case the control application, and the application causing the instruction execution checks the result of execution. Thus control application receives the result of the execution and

responds to the remote supervisory interface application that originally requested function command execution. Thus, Saleh teaches of supervisory application remotely receiving response from the software agent (monitored device control application) associated with a network device (ACD).

Regarding claims 1-8, the Applicant argues, "the asserted combination is an improper hindsight reconstruction based on the Applicant's disclosure". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Beckett clearly teaches a motivation "to allow one at said monitoring workstation to simultaneously view and hear" (col. 18, 54-55).

Further, the Applicant argues, "the control unit AU of Gerber does not include a format converter to translate at least a portion of a first signal representing network information into a second signal". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gerber teaches that it is advantageous if the control unit AU carries out a subscriber specific mapping of the data i.e. translating between XML data received from/to the user and data sent from/to SMDB (Paragraph 0047).

Regarding the Applicant's argument, "Beckett does not disclose using the voice card to convert a first signal representing network information into a second signal representing audible sound". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Beckett discloses that the voice hardware can support the use of analog phone (col. 17, ll. 34-35) and it is known in the art that analog phones require transmission of audible sound in the waveform which is converted from digital representation in the storage of hard drive (col. 15, ll. 26-28) by the voice hardware. Thus, Beckett discloses the voice hardware converting a first signal (digital sound) representing network information (conversation

status of monitored workstation) into a second signal representing audible sound (transmitted to the analog phone).

Regarding claims 9-10, the Applicant argues, "Metcalf does not teach a signal representing network information or a second and a third signal both translated from the first". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Metcalf teaches that the network server 106 may be used to provide subscriber or system administrator with access to system configuration information i.e. network information. The server receives this information signal from database 8. This first signal representing network information is converted into GUI or web pages in the network server as a second signal (Paragraph 0056) and also converted into content to be played to a user using VoiceXML files or text to speech engine as a third signal (Paragraph 0058).

Regarding claims 11-14 and 16-17, the limitation from dependent claim 15 is moved to independent parent claim 11. The Applicant argues, Gerber and Saleh do not disclose the specific combination of claim 11, particularly as amended. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The original reference art used for this limitation in claim 15 was Metcalf and is equally applicable to this limitation in claim 11. Metcalf teaches of user being able to use voice commands from the phone or mouse or keyboard input from a terminal and the content is made available to the user in audio or visual form accordingly (paragraphs 0056, 0058, 0059). Also, the script interpreter executing the command sends the result i.e. control output to the telephone control block 1101 and a multimedia control block 1105 suggesting the information conversion to audio (second signal) and audio/visual (third signal) respectively (Paragraph 0083).

Regarding claim 18, the Applicant argues, "McDuff does not teach initiating communication of information representing a graphical user interface to a party". Examiner respectfully disagrees. The instant application mentions that the network information may be communication to an administrator in *a format that allows a* graphical user interface to display textual and visual representation and GUI 52 may be represented within a display associated with an access device (Paragraph 1032). Also it describes the use of IM client, which is capable of showing a transcript of the verbal communication (Paragraph 1033). The instant application does not describe where the graphical user interface is generated. It merely states the information is in a format for graphical user interface or IM client of access device to be able to display. McDuff teaches a similar function of server communicating information to a client application in a format that the client displays.

Moreover, the Applicant argues, "McDuff does not disclose communicating graphical user interface information to a party to a call, from whom a spoken directive has been received". A party to call and receiving spoken directive are limitations of parent claim 11 and are discussed as part of claim 11. Communicating graphical user interface information is discussed above for claim 18.

Regarding claim 15, the Applicant argues, Gerber, Saleh and Metcalf do not teach the specific combination of claim 15, particularly as amended. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Saleh clearly teaches of supervisory application receiving response from monitored network device (ACD) control application and converting it to audible information and this portion is routed to the party (supervisor) via the call.

Gerber and Saleh do not teach of converting the response to graphical information and routing it to the party via data connection. But Metcalf teaches of converting network information to either speech routed via a call (paragraph 0058) or data routed as GUI or Web routed via data connection to browsers (Internet Explorer or Netscape Navigator) on user's computer terminal (Paragraphs 0056, 0059).

Regarding claim 19, the Applicant argues, "Metcalf does not teach converting a spoken directive received during a call into request for information". Examiner respectfully disagrees. This limitation is part of parent claim 11 and Saleh already teaches this as indicated for claims 11-14 on pg. 11 of Applicant response.

Moreover, the Applicant argues, "Metcalf does not teach decoupling such a call from a network management engine, and receiving an additional directive originating from an input device coupled to computing platform representing the network management engine". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Metcalf teaches of decoupling a call from network server (Paragraph 0066) and receiving additional directive originating from input device (user computer terminal that was originally connected and displayed a number to initiate the call by the party, Paragraph 0059) coupled to a computing platform (network server 106) representing the network management engine.

For the reasons discussed above, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the original rejections for the claims are repeated here for convenience except for the claims amended and to add more clarifications.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saleh (US Patent No. 6,654,458 B1).

Regarding claim 20, Saleh discloses a computer-readable medium (Fig. 1, item 30) having computer-readable data (col. 3, ll. 3-4, set of programming instructions) to receive a spoken directive from a party to a call, to convert the spoken directive into a request for information from a monitored network device, to receive a response from a software agent associated with the monitored network device, to convert the response into a spoken response, and to initiate playing of the spoken response to the party (col. 6, ll. 32-47). Saleh discloses that the supervisory interface application 40 may reside on one of the supervisor's terminal and remotely access ACD control applications 42, 44 (device agents) (col. 4, ll. 5-12). The application 40 functions to access the related application 42, 44 and make the requested changes (col. 5, ll. 32-34). The proper

Art Unit: 2645

applications convert the command into format, which the CPU 28 can execute. The command is sent to the CPU 28 (by the control application) and the CPU confirms execution of the change (results to requesting application, in this case control application) (col. 6, ll. 37-42). It is known in the art that CPU is merely a hardware that executes one instruction at a time given to it by software application, in this case the control application, and the application causing the instruction execution checks the result of execution. Thus control application receives the result of the execution and responds to the remote supervisory interface application that originally requested function command execution. Thus, Saleh teaches of supervisory application remotely receiving response from the software agent (monitored device control application) associated with a network device (ACD).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerber (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0025806 A1), and further in view of Beckett (US Patent No. 6,510,220 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Gerber teaches of a network monitoring system comprising:

a network management engine (Fig. 2, item NECONTR, paragraph 0031) operable to issue a request to a monitored network device agent (Fig. 2, item NE1, NE2) and to receive network information from the monitored network device agent (paragraph 0031);

a multi-modal administration engine (Fig. 2, item NMS) operable to allow a party to a call to interact with the network management engine;

a caller response unit (Fig. 2, item AU) associated with the multi-modal administration engine, the caller response unit operable to receive a user input from the party and to convert the user input into a directive for the network management engine (paragraph 0047, allowing dialog based on XML and WAP to read and/or modify data);

a format converter (Fig. 2, item AU) associated with the multi-modal administration engine, the format converter operable to translate at least a portion of a first signal representing network information (paragraph 0047, subscriber-specific mapping of data between user and SMDB) into a second signal.

Gerber does not teach of format conversion to audible sound.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Beckett teaches of a system using voice hardware (Fig. 1, item 50, col. 17. ll. 30-34) with monitor server to allow telephone connection.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber to include the use of voice hardware with monitor server as taught by Beckett in order to enable the system to be monitored visually as well as

audibly (Beckett, "to allow one at said monitoring workstation to simultaneously view and hear", col. 18, 54-55).

Regarding claim 2, Gerber teaches of the system further comprising:

an authentication engine (Fig. 2, item AU) communicatively coupled to the caller response unit and operable to consider an initial set of credentials (paragraph 0042, Subscriber identification code) received from the party; and

an authorization engine (Fig. 2, item AU) operable to grant access (paragraph 0044) to the multi-modal administration engine in response to authorization of the initial set of credentials.

Regarding claim 3, Gerber teaches of the system further comprising a telephone interface operable to receive the call (paragraph 0026, user using mobile radio terminal for access).

Regarding claim 4, Gerber teaches of using voice over internet protocol (VoIP) for communication network (paragraph 0018).

Regarding claim 5, Gerber does not teach of the system, wherein the network management engine relies on a request/response protocol to monitor a network.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Beckett teaches of a system using a request (col. 4, ll. 62-63, data polls to agents) and response (col. 4, ll. 66-67, agents returning selected screen information data) protocol to monitor network.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber to include the use of request and response protocol as taught by Beckett in order to monitor the network elements.

Regarding claim 6, Gerber discloses the system, wherein the multi-modal administration engine (Fig. 2, item NMS) is operable to allow the party to direct the network management engine (Fig. 2, item NECONTR) to issue a second request (paragraph 0031, NECONTR modifying NE2 data in SMDB to control NE2) to a second monitored network device agent (NE2).

Regarding claim 7, Gerber discloses the system further comprising:

an authentication engine (Fig. 2, item AU) communicatively coupled to the caller response unit and operable to consider an initial set of credentials (paragraph 0043, Subscriber identification code) received from the party;

an authorization engine (Fig. 2, item AU) operable to grant access (paragraph 0044) to the multi-modal administration engine in response to authorization of the initial set of credentials; and

a telephone interface operable to receive the call (paragraph 0026, user using mobile radio terminal for access).

Regarding claim 8, Gerber teaches of a system using SNMP protocol (paragraph 0020).

5. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerber and Beckett as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Metcalf (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0122541 A1).

Regarding claim 9, Gerber and Beckett do not teach of a system operable to determine an access device type used by the party to interact with the network management engine, wherein the format converter is further operable to translate at

least a second portion of the first signal representing network information into a third signal receivable by the access device type.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Metcalf teaches of a system determining the type of telephony interface (access device type) used with each call (paragraph 0035) and also making the content (information) available to the user of the system in a different manner (paragraph 0059).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber and Beckett to include the use of determining access type and providing information in a different manner as taught by Metcalf in order to provide a more suitable experience to the user (Metcalf 0059).

Regarding claim 10, Gerber and Beckett do not teach of a system comprising a modality engine operable to route the second signal to a first access device and to route additional network information to a second access device.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Metcalf teaches of a system to route signals to different devices of the same user (paragraph 0079, information to telephone as well as network-connected terminal).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber and Beckett to include the use of presenting information to various devices used by the user as taught by Metcalf in order to provide information to the user in audio as well as visual format.

6. Claims 11-14, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerber, and further in view of Saleh (US Patent No. 6,654,458 B1), and further in view of Metcalf (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0122541 A1).

Regarding claim 11, Gerber teaches of the network monitoring method comprising:

communicatively coupling a voice call to a network management engine (paragraphs 0026, 0027);

Gerber does not teach of receiving a spoken directive from a party to the call and converting the spoken directive into a request for information from a monitored network device and re recognizing that a party can receive audible information via the call and graphical information via a data connection.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Saleh teaches of a system receiving a spoken directive from a party to the call (col. 5, ll. 13-21); and converting the spoken directive into a request for information from a monitored network device (col. 5, ll. 13-21) and recognizing that a party can receive audible information via the call (col. 2, ll. 60-col. 3, ll. 14, depending on the origin of call, corresponding source address is provided i.e. ANI of the caller in case of telephone call).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber to include voice response functionality as taught by Saleh in order to receive a spoken directive and convert it into a request for information from a monitored network device to provide enhanced access to the network management by the user.

Gerber and Saleh do not teach of recognizing that a party can receive graphical information via a data connection.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Metcalf teaches of using voice commands from the phone (Paragraph 0059) or mouse or keyboard input from a terminal (Paragraph 0056, 0059, using computer terminal and web browsers).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber and Saleh to include graphical interface user functionality as taught by Metcalf in order to provide content in visual display (Metcalf, Paragraph 0059) in addition to playing the content audibly to a user in the course of the call (Metcalf, Paragraph 0058).

Regarding claim 12, Gerber discloses the method, further comprising:
receiving a request for network control from the party (paragraphs 0026, 0027);
prompting the party to input a first set of credentials (paragraph 0042, subscriber identification code); and
authenticating the first set of credentials (paragraphs 0042, 0043).

Regarding claim 13, Gerber teaches of a system using SNMP protocol (paragraph 0020).

Regarding claim 14, Gerber discloses the method, further comprising:
receiving a response from a software agent associated with the monitored network device (paragraph 0031, receive status data from the network elements);

Gerber does not teach of converting the response into a spoken response and playing the spoken response to the party.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Saleh teaches of a system converting the response into a spoken response (col. 5, ll. 45-46) and playing the spoken response to the party (col. 5, ll. 51-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber to include converting response to spoken response and playing as taught by Saleh in order to provide convenient audible response "for the benefit of the supervisor" (Saleh, col. 5, ll. 52).

Regarding claim 15, Saleh teaches of a supervisory application receiving response from monitored network device (ACD) control application (the supervisory interface application 40 may reside on one of the supervisor's terminal and remotely access ACD control applications 42, 44 (device agents) (col. 4, ll. 5-12). The application 40 functions to access the related application 42, 44 and make the requested changes (col. 5, ll. 32-34). The proper applications convert the command into format, which the CPU 28 can execute. The command is sent to the CPU 28 (by the control application) and the CPU confirms execution of the change (results to requesting application, in this case control application) (col. 6, ll. 37-42). It is known in the art that CPU is merely a hardware that executes one instruction at a time given to it by software application, in this case the control application, and the application causing the instruction execution checks the result of execution. Thus control application receives the result of the execution and responds to the remote supervisory interface application that originally requested function command execution. Thus, Saleh teaches of supervisory application

Art Unit: 2645

remotely receiving response from the software agent (monitored device control application) associated with a network device (ACD));

converting this response to audible information (col. 5, ll. 46-47, ll. 50-52); and routing this portion to the party (supervisor) via the call.

Gerber and Saleh do not teach of converting the response to graphical information and routing it to the party via data connection.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Metcalf teaches of converting network information to either speech routed via a call (paragraph 0058) or data routed as GUI or Web routed via data connection to browsers (Internet Explorer or Netscape Navigator) on user's computer terminal (Paragraphs 0056, 0059).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber and Saleh to include graphical user functionality as taught by Metcalf in order to provide content in visual display (Metcalf, Paragraph 0059) in addition to playing the content audibly to a user in the course of the call (Metcalf, Paragraph 0058).

Regarding claim 16, Gerber teaches of a method, further comprising:

receiving a keyed in directive from the party, the keyed in directive comprising dual tone multi-frequency signals (paragraph 0026).

Regarding claim 17, Gerber teaches of a method of using TCP/IP protocol for an interface to mobile radio terminals (paragraphs 0038, 0039).

Regarding claim 19, Gerber and Saleh do not teach of a method, further comprising:

decoupling the voice call from the network management engine, and receiving an additional directive originating from an input device coupled to computing platform comprising the network management engine.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Metcalf teaches of decoupling a call from network server (Paragraph 0066) and receiving additional directive originating from input device (user computer terminal that was originally connected and which originally displayed a number for the party to initiate the call, Paragraph 0059) coupled to a computing platform (network server 106) representing the network management engine.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber and Saleh to include the decoupling of a call from network server as taught by Metcalf in order to save resources by freeing up dedicated resource used by the call and continue monitoring with original web browser session.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerber, Saleh and Metcalf as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of McDuff (US Patent No. 6,490,350 B2).

Regarding claim 18, Gerber, Saleh and Metcalf do not specifically teach of a method comprising initiating communication to the party of information representing a graphical user interface that displays a visual representation of a network monitored by the network management engine.

However, in the same field of endeavor, McDuff teaches of a method initiating communication to a party of information representing a graphical user interface that displays a visual representation of a call center monitored by the monitoring server (Fig. 13, col. 2, ll. 47-49, col. 11, ll. 40-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Gerber, Saleh and Metcalf to include the use of graphical user interface for representation of information as taught by McDuff in order to provide visual status of the network being monitored.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2645

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hemant Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-8620. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OVIDIO ESCALANTE
PATENT EXAMINER

Ovidio Escalante

Hemant Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2645

HSP

HSP